

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7                   UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
8                   WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
9                   AT SEATTLE

10                  GS HOLISTIC, LLC,

CASE NO. C23-0315JLR

11                  Plaintiff,

ORDER

12                  v.

13                  IMAM CORPORATION INC., et al,

14                  Defendants.

15                   **I. INTRODUCTION**

16         Before the court is Plaintiff GS Holistic, LLC’s (“GS Holistic”) motion for entry  
17 of default judgment against Defendants Imam Corporation Inc., d/b/a Mukilteo Smoke  
18 Shop (“Mukilteo Smoke Shop”) and Ayaz Ahmed (together, “Defendants”). (Mot. (Dkt.  
19 # 26); *see* Prop. Judgment (Dkt. # 26-3).) Neither Defendant has appeared in this action,  
20 and the Clerk has entered default against both Defendants. (*See* Dkt.; 12/13/23 Entry of  
21 Default (Dkt. # 22).) The court has considered GS Holistic’s motion, the materials it  
22 submitted in support of its motion, the relevant portions of the record, and the governing

1 law. Being fully advised, the court GRANTS in part and DENIES in part GS Holistic's  
2 motion for entry of default judgment.

3 **II. BACKGROUND**

4 GS Holistic is a Delaware limited liability corporation ("LLC") that has its  
5 principal place of business in California. (Am. Compl. (Dkt. # 8) ¶ 4.) It alleges that it is  
6 the owner of the "STÜNDENGLASS" trademark, has worked to distinguish the  
7 Stündenglass brand as "the premier manufacturer of glass infusers," and has devoted  
8 significant time and resources promoting and protecting its trademark. (*Id.* ¶¶ 4, 7-9, 14.)  
9 GS Holistic has registered the following trademarks: (1) U.S. Trademark Registration  
10 No. 6,633,884 "for the standard character mark 'Stündenglass' in association with goods  
11 further identified in registration in international class 011"; (2) U.S. Trademark  
12 Registration No. 6,174,292 "for the design plus words mark 'S' and its logo in  
13 association with goods further identified in the registration in international class 034";  
14 and (3) U.S. Trademark Registration No. 6,174,291 "for the standard character mark  
15 'Stündenglass' in association with goods further identified in registration in international  
16 class 034" (together, the "Stündenglass Marks"). (*Id.* ¶ 10; *see also* Mot., Ex. A  
17 (screenshots of pages from the United States Patent and Trademark Office's Trademark  
18 Electronic Search System that describe each trademark).) GS Holistic asserts that  
19 consumers are willing to pay more for "the recognized quality and innovation associated  
20 with the Stündenglass Marks." (Am. Compl. ¶ 20.) Thus, genuine Stündenglass glass  
21 infusers are priced at \$599.95, while non-Stündenglass infusers sell for between \$199.00  
22 and \$600.00. (*Id.*)

1       Defendant Mukilteo Smoke Shop is a Washington corporation that has its  
2 principal place of business in Washington. (*Id.* ¶ 5.) Defendant Ayaz Ahmed is a  
3 resident and citizen of Washington. (*Id.* ¶ 6.) GS Holistic asserts that Defendants sold  
4 counterfeit products bearing the Stündenglass Marks. (*Id.* ¶¶ 24-27.) On December 5,  
5 2022, according to GS Holistic, its investigator visited Mukilteo Smoke Shop’s location;  
6 observed that the shop had “an excess” of glass infusers that displayed the Stündenglass  
7 Marks; purchased a glass infuser “with a Stündenglass Mark affixed to it” for \$420.28;  
8 and determined the glass infuser was a counterfeit product that displayed “the Infringing  
9 Marks.” (*Id.* ¶ 29; *see also id.* ¶ 25 (defining the “Infringing Marks” as “reproductions,  
10 counterfeits, copies, and/or colorable imitations of one or more of the Stündenglass  
11 Marks”).)

12       GS Holistic filed its complaint on March 6, 2023. (*See* Compl. (Dkt. # 1) at 1.) It  
13 amended its complaint on April 10, 2023. (*See* Am. Compl.) It alleges claims under the  
14 Lanham Act against both Defendants for counterfeiting and trademark infringement in  
15 violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1114 and for false designation of origin and unfair competition  
16 in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a). (*Id.* ¶¶ 51-68.) Among other relief, it seeks  
17 damages, costs of suit, a permanent injunction prohibiting Defendants from continuing to  
18 infringe its Stündenglass trademarks, and an order requiring Defendants to deliver all  
19 infringing products to GS Holistic for destruction. (*Id.* at 12-14.)

20       GS Holistic served Mukilteo Smoke Shop on May 9, 2023, and Mr. Ahmed on  
21 September 6, 2023. (*See* Service Affs. (Dkt. ## 12, 19).) The Clerk entered default on  
22

1 December 13, 2023. (Entry of Default.) GS Holistic filed this motion for entry of default  
2 judgment on March 7, 2024. (Mot.)

3 **III. ANALYSIS**

4 Below, the court sets forth the relevant legal standard and then evaluates GS  
5 Holistic's motion for entry of default judgment.

6 **A. Legal Standard**

7 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 55(b)(2) authorizes the court to enter default  
8 judgment against a defaulting defendant upon the plaintiff's motion. Fed. R. Civ. P.  
9 55(a), (b)(2). After default is entered, well-pleaded factual allegations in the complaint,  
10 except those related to damages, are considered admitted and are sufficient to establish a  
11 defendant's liability. *TeleVideo Sys., Inc. v. Heidenthal*, 826 F.2d 915, 917-18 (9th Cir.  
12 1987) (citing *Geddes v. United Fin. Grp.*, 559 F.2d 557, 560 (9th Cir. 1977)).

13 Entry of default judgment is left to the court's sound discretion. *Aldabe v. Aldabe*,  
14 616 F.2d 1089, 1092 (9th Cir. 1980). In exercising its discretion, the court considers  
15 seven factors (the "Eitel factors"): (1) the possibility of prejudice to the plaintiff if relief  
16 is denied; (2) the substantive merits of the plaintiff's claims; (3) the sufficiency of the  
17 claims raised in the complaint; (4) the sum of money at stake in relationship to the  
18 defendant's behavior; (5) the possibility of a dispute concerning material facts;  
19 (6) whether default was due to excusable neglect; and (7) the preference for decisions on  
20 the merits when reasonably possible. *Eitel v. McCool*, 782 F.2d 1470, 1471-72 (9th Cir.  
21 1986). After the court determines that default judgment is appropriate, it must then  
22

1 determine the amount and character of the relief that should be awarded. *See TeleVideo*,  
2 826 F.2d at 917-18.

3 **B. Whether the *Eitel* Factors Favor Default Judgment**

4 The court preliminarily determines that default judgment is warranted in this case  
5 because, on balance, the *Eitel* factors weigh in favor of such judgment. The court  
6 discusses each factor in turn.

7 1. Possibility of Prejudice to Plaintiff

8 The first *Eitel* factor considers whether the plaintiff will suffer prejudice if default  
9 judgment is not entered. *See PepsiCo, Inc., v. Cal. Sec. Cans*, 238 F. Supp. 2d 1172,  
10 1177 (C.D. Cal. 2002). Without default judgment, GS Holistic will suffer prejudice  
11 because it will “be denied the right to judicial resolution” of its claims and will be  
12 “without other recourse for recovery.” *Elektra Entm’t Grp. Inc. v. Crawford*, 226 F.R.D.  
13 388, 392 (C.D. Cal. 2005). Thus, the first *Eitel* factor weighs in favor of entering default  
14 judgment.

15 2. Substantive Merits and Sufficiency of the Complaint

16 The second and third *Eitel* factors—the substantive merits of the plaintiff’s claim  
17 and the sufficiency of the plaintiff’s complaint—are frequently analyzed together.  
18 *PepsiCo*, 238 F. Supp. 2d at 1175. For these two factors to weigh in favor of default  
19 judgment, the complaint’s allegations must be sufficient to state a claim for relief.  
20 *Danning v. Lavine*, 572 F.2d 1386, 1388 (9th Cir. 1978). A complaint satisfies this  
21 standard when it “contain[s] sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to ‘state a claim to  
22 relief that is plausible on its face.’” *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (quoting

1     | *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)). At the default judgment  
 2 stage, the court “must take the well-pleaded factual allegations [in the complaint] as true”  
 3 but “necessary facts not contained in the pleadings, and claims which are legally  
 4 insufficient, are not established by default.” *Cripps v. Life Ins. Co. of N. Am.*, 980 F.2d  
 5 1261, 1267 (9th Cir. 1992).

6                 GS Holistic alleges claims for trademark counterfeiting and infringement under 15  
 7 U.S.C. § 1114 and false designation of origin and unfair competition under 15 U.S.C.  
 8 § 1125(a). (Am. Compl. ¶¶ 51-68.) The court reviews each in turn.

9                     a.         *Trademark Counterfeiting and Infringement*

10                 To prove liability for trademark infringement, the trademark holder must  
 11 demonstrate: (1) “ownership of a valid mark (i.e., a protectable interest”); and (2) the  
 12 alleged infringer’s use of the mark “is likely to cause confusion, or to cause mistake, or to  
 13 deceive” consumers. *Reno Air Racing Ass’n. v. McCord*, 452 F.3d 1126, 1134 (9th Cir.  
 14 2006) (quoting *KP Permanent Make-Up, Inc. v. Lasting Impression I, Inc.*, 408 F.3d 596,  
 15 602 (9th Cir. 2005)).

16                 First, uncontested proof that the plaintiff has registered the mark is sufficient to  
 17 establish ownership of a valid mark. *Pom Wonderful LLC v. Hubbard*, 775 F.3d 1118,  
 18 1124 (9th Cir. 2014). Thus, because GS Holistic alleges that it registered the  
 19 Stündenglass Marks, it satisfies the first element of trademark infringement for the  
 20 purpose of default judgment. (Am. Compl. ¶ 10; *see* Mot. at A.)

21                 Second, “[l]ikelihood of confusion exists when consumers viewing the mark  
 22 would probably assume that the goods it represents are associated with the source of a

1 different product identified by a similar mark.” *KP Permanent Make-Up*, 408 F.3d at  
 2 608. Courts generally evaluate eight factors to determine whether confusion is likely:  
 3 “1) the strength of the mark; 2) proximity or relatedness of the goods; 3) the similarity of  
 4 the marks; 4) evidence of actual confusion; 5) the marketing channels used; 6) the degree  
 5 of care customers are likely to exercise in purchasing the goods; 7) the defendant’s intent  
 6 in selecting the mark; and 8) the likelihood of expansion into other markets.” *Id.* Where  
 7 a defendant uses a counterfeit mark, however, courts both within and outside the Ninth  
 8 Circuit presume a likelihood of consumer confusion. *See Coach, Inc. v. Pegasus Theater*  
 9 *Shops*, No. C12-1631MJP, 2013 WL 5406220, at \*3 (W.D. Wash. Sept. 25, 2013)  
 10 (compiling cases); *see also Fendi Adele S.R.L. v. Burlington Coat Factory Warehouse*  
 11 *Corp.*, 689 F. Supp. 2d 585, 597 (S.D.N.Y. 2010) (“To find a likelihood of confusion, a  
 12 court need only determine that the items at issue are counterfeit and that the defendant  
 13 distributed, offered for sale, or sold the items.”). The Lanham Act defines a “counterfeit”  
 14 as “a spurious mark which is identical with, or substantially indistinguishable from, a  
 15 registered mark.” 15 U.S.C. § 1127.

16       Here, GS Holistic alleges that its investigator purchased a glass infuser with a  
 17 Stündenglass Mark “affixed” to it and determined that it was a counterfeit product that  
 18 displayed the “the Infringing Marks.” (Am. Compl. ¶ 29.) GS Holistic further alleges  
 19 that the “Infringing Marks” are “reproductions, counterfeits, copies and/or colorable  
 20 imitations of one or more of the Stündenglass Marks.” (*Id.* ¶ 25.) Accordingly, the court  
 21 concludes that GS Holistic has sufficiently alleged that Defendants sold a product bearing  
 22 a counterfeit mark and, as a result, there is a presumption of consumer confusion. *See*

1     | *Coach, Inc.*, 2013 WL 5406220, at \*3. Thus, because GS Holistic has demonstrated that  
 2     it owns a valid mark and that Defendants' use of the mark is likely to cause consumer  
 3     confusion, the court concludes that GS Holistic has sufficiently alleged its trademark  
 4     counterfeiting and infringement claim.

5                 b.     *False Designation of Origin*

6                 To show liability for false designation of origin, the plaintiff must show that the  
 7     defendant "(1) use[d] in commerce (2) any word, false designation of origin, false or  
 8     misleading description, or representation of fact, which (3) is likely to cause confusion or  
 9     misrepresents the characteristics of his or another person's goods or services." *Freecycle*  
 10    *Network, Inc. v. Oey*, 505 F.3d 898, 902 (9th Cir. 2007). As to the first two elements, GS  
 11    Holistic alleges that Defendants sold (and thus, used in commerce) at least one glass  
 12    infuser bearing at least one of its registered trademarks. (Am. Compl. ¶¶ 28-29.) And  
 13    the court concluded above that GS Holistic has plausibly alleged a likelihood of  
 14    confusion resulting from Defendants' use of the trademarks. Accordingly, GS Holistic  
 15    has stated a false designation of origin claim.

16                 Because GS Holistic has demonstrated that its claims have substantive merit and  
 17     that it has sufficiently alleged those claims in its complaint, the court concludes that the  
 18     second and third *Eitel* factors weigh in favor of default judgment.

19                 3.     Sum of Money at Stake

20                 Under the fourth *Eitel* factor, "the court must consider the amount of money at  
 21     stake in relation to the seriousness of the [d]efendant's conduct." *PepsiCo*, 238 F. Supp.  
 22    2d at 1176. Here, GS Holistic seeks (1) \$150,000 in statutory damages—\$50,000 per

1 Stündenglass trademark—for willful trademark counterfeiting under 15 U.S.C. § 1117(d)  
 2 and (2) costs in the amount of \$1,312.28. (See Mot. at 2.) The court concludes that the  
 3 requested statutory damages and costs are not so unreasonable in relation to the conduct  
 4 alleged in the complaint as to weigh against entry of default judgment.

5       4. Possibility of a Dispute over Material Facts

6       “The fifth *Eitel* factor considers the possibility of dispute as to any material facts  
 7 in the case.” *PepsiCo*, 238 F. Supp. 2d at 1177. Where, as here, the defendant has  
 8 defaulted, the court must take all well-pleaded allegations in the complaint as true, except  
 9 those related to damages. *TeleVideo*, 826 F.2d at 917-18; see also *Wecosign, Inc. v. IFG Holdings, Inc.*, 845 F. Supp. 2d 1072, 1082 (C.D. Cal. 2012) (“Where a plaintiff has filed  
 11 a well-pleaded complaint, the possibility of dispute concerning material facts is  
 12 remote.”). Thus, the court concludes there is little risk of dispute over material facts and  
 13 the fifth *Eitel* factor weighs in favor of granting default judgment.

14       5. Excusable Neglect

15       The sixth *Eitel* factor considers the possibility that the defendant’s default resulted  
 16 from excusable neglect. *PepsiCo*, 238 F. Supp. 2d at 1177. Here, GS Holistic has  
 17 provided evidence that Defendants were properly served (see Service Affs.), and there is  
 18 no evidence in the record that Defendants’ failure to answer or respond is the result of  
 19 excusable neglect. Accordingly, the court concludes that the sixth *Eitel* factor weighs in  
 20 favor of default judgment.

21 //

22 //

1       6.     Policy Favoring Decisions on the Merits

2           “Cases should be decided upon their merits whenever reasonably possible.” *Eitel*,  
 3 782 F.2d at 1472. Where, as here, a defendant fails to appear or defend itself in action,  
 4 however, the policy favoring decisions on the merits is not dispositive. *PepsiCo*, 238 F.  
 5 Supp. 2d at 1177. Therefore, the court concludes that the seventh *Eitel* factor does not  
 6 preclude entry of default judgment.

7           In sum, because the *Eitel* factors weigh in favor of default judgment, the court  
 8 concludes that entry of default judgment is warranted in favor of GS Holistic on its  
 9 claims against Defendants.

10      C.     **Requested Relief**

11           The court now turns to the issue of remedies. “A default judgment must not differ  
 12 in kind from, or exceed in amount, what is demanded in the [complaint].” Fed. R. Civ. P.  
 13 54(c); *see Fong v. United States*, 300 F.2d 400, 413 (9th Cir. 1962). Defaulting  
 14 defendants are not deemed to have admitted the facts alleged in the complaint concerning  
 15 the amount of damages. *TeleVideo*, 826 F.2d at 917. Rather, the plaintiff “must ‘prove  
 16 up’ the amount of damages that it is claiming.” *Philip Morris USA, Inc. v. Castworld  
 17 Prod., Inc.*, 219 F.R.D. 494, 501 (C.D. Cal. 2003); *see also* Local Rules W.D. Wash.  
 18 LCR 55(b)(2).<sup>1</sup> By analogy, plaintiffs must also “prove up” their entitlement to other

19  
 20           

---

  
 21           <sup>1</sup> This court’s Local Civil Rules require plaintiffs to support a motion for default  
 22 judgment with:

a declaration and other evidence establishing [the] plaintiff’s entitlement to a sum  
 certain and to any nonmonetary relief sought. [The] [p]laintiff shall provide a  
 concise explanation of how all amounts were calculated, and shall support this

1 forms of relief, such as a permanent injunction. *See Gucci Am., Inc. v. Tyrrell-Miller*,  
 2 678 F. Supp. 2d 117, 120-21 (S.D.N.Y. 2008).

3 GS Holistic requests statutory damages, litigation costs, injunctive relief, and  
 4 destruction of the infringing products. (See Mot. at 12-16.) The court considers each  
 5 remedy below.

6 1. Statutory Damages

7 Under the Lanham Act, a plaintiff may elect whether to recover its actual damages  
 8 caused by the defendants' use of a counterfeit mark or statutory damages. 15 U.S.C.  
 9 § 1117(c). GS Holistic has elected to seek statutory damages. (Mot. at 12-15; *see Am.*  
 10 Compl. at 12-13 (including statutory damages in its prayer for relief).)

11 The court has discretion to award statutory damages between \$1,000 and \$200,000  
 12 "per counterfeit mark per type of goods or services sold, offered for sale, or distributed,  
 13 as the court considers just." 15 U.S.C. § 1117(c)(1). If, however, the court finds that the  
 14 trademark violation was willful, it may award up to \$2,000,000 for each infringement.  
 15 *Id.* § 1117(c)(2). "[S]tatutory damages may compensate the victim, penalize the  
 16 wrongdoer, deter future wrongdoing, or serve all those purposes." *Y.Y.G.M. SA v.*  
 17 *Redbubble, Inc.*, 75 F.4th 995, 1008 (9th Cir. 2023) (citing *Nintendo of Am., Inc. v.*  
 18 *Dragon Pac. Int'l*, 40 F.3d 1007, 1011 (9th Cir. 1994)). When determining the  
 19

---

20 explanation with evidence establishing the entitlement to and amount of the  
 21 principal claim, and, if applicable, any liquidated damages, interest, attorney's fees,  
 22 or other amounts sought[.]

Local Rules W.D. Wash. LCR 55(b)(2).

1 appropriate amount of statutory damages to award on default judgment, courts consider  
 2 whether the amount bears a “plausible relationship to [the p]laintiff’s actual damages.”  
 3 *Yelp Inc. v. Catron*, 70 F. Supp. 3d 1082, 1102 (N.D. Cal. 2014) (quoting *Adobe Sys., Inc. v. Tilley*, No. C 09-1085 PJH, 2010 WL 309249, at \*5 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 19, 2010)). That  
 5 is, although a plaintiff in a trademark infringement suit is entitled to damages that will  
 6 compensate and serve as a deterrent, “it is not entitled to a windfall.” *Id.*

7 GS Holistic requests statutory damages of \$50,000 for each of its registered  
 8 trademarks, for a total of \$150,000. (Mot. at 12-15.) GS Holistic’s evidence of its actual  
 9 damages caused by Defendants’ trademark violations, however, is limited to allegations  
 10 that its investigator observed “an excess of Glass Infusers which displayed” the  
 11 Stündenglass Marks and purchased a single glass infuser with an unspecified  
 12 Stündenglass Mark “affixed to it” for \$420.28. (*See* Am. Compl. ¶ 29.) GS Holistic  
 13 contends that its chief executive officer’s (“CEO”) declaration establishes that \$150,000  
 14 is “only a fraction of the actual losses to its business” caused by counterfeiters. (Mot. at  
 15 13.) That declaration, however, provides no explanation of how GS Holistic’s CEO  
 16 determined that the company’s total U.S. sales would have quadrupled in 2022 if there  
 17 were no counterfeit products in the market and says nothing about the damages  
 18 specifically caused by the Defendants in this case. (*See generally* 2d Folkerts Decl. (Dkt.  
 19 # 29) ¶¶ 13-14.) The court is sympathetic to the difficulties GS Holistic faces in  
 20 estimating actual damages with any degree of certainty without the benefit of  
 21 Defendants’ cooperation in discovery. (*See* Mot. at 13.) Without more evidence,  
 22 however, the court cannot conclude that an award of \$50,000 in statutory damages for

each of GS Holistic's three registered trademarks bears a "plausible relationship" to GS Holistic's actual damages in this case. *Yelp Inc.*, 70 F. Supp. 3d at 1102.

Because GS Holistic alleges only that the glass infuser its investigator purchased had “a Stündenglass Mark affixed to it” (Am. Compl. ¶ 29), the court concludes that GS Holistic is entitled to statutory damages based on Defendants’ conduct with respect to only one trademark. The court further concludes, in its discretion, that an award of \$5,000 for one trademark violation will serve the compensatory, penal, and deterrent purposes of statutory damages without resulting in an undue windfall for GS Holistic. This amount equates to more than ten times the price of the allegedly infringing glass infuser purchased by GS Holistic’s investigator. (*See id.*) Accordingly, the court awards GS Holistic statutory damages of \$5,000.<sup>2</sup>

## 2. Litigation Costs

Under the Lanham Act, a plaintiff who establishes that a defendant has violated a trademark “shall be entitled, . . . subject to the principles of equity, to recover . . . the costs of the action.” 15 U.S.C. § 1117(a). Here, GS Holistic seeks costs in the total amount of \$1,312.28, consisting of the filing fee (\$402.00), its process server fees (\$425.00), and its investigator’s fees (\$485.28). (Mot. at 13 (citing Harris Decl. (Dkt.

<sup>2</sup> GS Holistic cites several cases in which courts in the Central District of California and the Southern District of Florida awarded it statutory damages of \$150,000 or more on default judgment. (*See Mot.* at 15 (compiling cases).) The court respectfully disagrees with the reasoning set forth in these decisions and finds far more persuasive the reasoning set forth in *GS Holistic, LLC v. MSA-Bossy Inc.*, No. 22-CV-07638-JSC, 2023 WL 3604322, at \*6 (N.D. Cal. May 22, 2023) (noting that GS Holistic’s request for \$150,000 in statutory damages was “out of all proportion to its actual damages” and awarding statutory damages of \$5,000).

# 27) ¶ 6); *see* Am. Compl. at 12-13 (including costs of suit in the prayer for relief).) The court awards GS Holistic its filing fee and process server fees because these are costs that are routinely awarded in Lanham Act cases. GS Holistic has not, however, cited any authority for the proposition that its investigator's fees are recognized "costs of the action" under the Lanham Act. (*See generally* Mot.) Therefore, the court awards GS Holistic costs in the amount of \$827.00.

### 3. Injunctive Relief

The Lanham Act empowers courts "to grant injunctions, according to the principles of equity and upon such terms as the court may deem reasonable, to prevent the violation of any right of the registrant of a mark." 15 U.S.C. § 1116(a).

According to well-established principles of equity, a plaintiff seeking a permanent injunction must satisfy a four-factor test before a court may grant such relief. A plaintiff must demonstrate: (1) that it has suffered an irreparable injury; (2) that remedies available at law, such as monetary damages, are inadequate to compensate for that injury; (3) that, considering the balance of hardships between the plaintiff and defendant, a remedy in equity is warranted; and (4) that the public interest would not be disserved by a permanent injunction.

*eBay Inc. v. MercExchange, L.L.C.*, 547 U.S. 388, 391 (2006) (interpreting similar language in considering a motion for permanent injunctive relief under the Patent Act).

The Lanham Act provides, in the case of a motion for a permanent injunction, that a "plaintiff seeking any such injunction shall be entitled to a rebuttable presumption of irreparable harm upon a finding of a [trademark] violation." 15 U.S.C. § 1116(a).

GS Holistic asks the court to enter a permanent injunction enjoining Mukilteo Smoke Shop, Mr. Ahmed, and "their agents, employees, officers, directors, owners,

1 representatives, successor companies, related companies, and all persons acting in  
2 concern or participation with” them from:

3 (a) Import, export, making, manufacture, reproduction, assembly, use,  
4 acquisition, purchase, offer, sale, transfer, brokerage, consignment,  
5 distribution, storage, shipment, licensing, development, display, delivery,  
6 marketing advertising or promotion of the counterfeit Stündenglass  
7 product identified in the complaint and any other unauthorized  
8 Stündenglass product, counterfeit, copy or colorful imitation thereof[.]

9 (Mot. at 15-16.)

10 The court declines to enter the requested permanent injunction. First, GS Holistic  
11 argues only that it is entitled to injunctive relief “[b]y the reasons explained in [its]  
12 Complaint.” (*Id.*) It does not address the factors a court must consider before entering a  
13 permanent injunction. (*See id.*); *see eBay Inc.*, 547 U.S. at 391. Second, although GS  
14 Holistic’s complaint describes the sale of one counterfeit Stündenglass glass infuser  
15 displaying one unspecified Stündenglass Mark, it requests a wider injunction relating to  
16 “the counterfeit Stündenglass product identified in the complaint and any other  
17 unauthorized Stündenglass product.” (*Compare Am. Compl. ¶ 29, with Mot. at 15-16.*)  
18 Finally, “every order granting an injunction” must “describe in reasonable detail—and  
19 not by referring to the complaint or other document—the act or acts restrained or  
20 required.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 65(d). GS Holistic’s proposed order violates this rule by  
21 referring to “the counterfeit Stündenglass product identified in the complaint.” (*See Mot.*  
22 *at 15-16.*) For these reasons, the court denies GS Holistic’s request to enter a permanent  
injunction.

1       4.     Destruction of Infringing Products

2             Finally, GS Holistic seeks an order directing Defendants, “at their cost, [to] deliver  
3 to [GS Holistic] for destruction all products, accessories, labels, signs, prints, packages,  
4 wrappers, receptables, advertisements, and other material in their possession, custody or  
5 control bearing any of the Stündenglass Marks.” (Mot. at 16.) The Lanham Act  
6 authorizes the court to issue an order directing the destruction of articles that infringe  
7 upon a trademark. 15 U.S.C. § 1118. Here, however, GS Holistic has not presented any  
8 argument or evidence supporting its entitlement to this relief, and—as with its request for  
9 a permanent injunction—its request for destruction of any article “bearing any of the  
10 Stündenglass Marks” is not supported by its investigator’s purchase of a single glass  
11 infuser bearing an unspecified Stündenglass Mark. (*See* Mot. at 16; Am. Compl. ¶ 29.)  
12 As a result, the court denies GS Holistic’s request for an order directing the destruction of  
13 allegedly infringing products.

14                          **IV. CONCLUSION**

15             For the foregoing reasons, the court GRANTS in part and DENIES in part GS  
16 Holistic’s motion for default judgment (Dkt. # 26). Specifically, the court GRANTS GS  
17 Holistic’s request for entry of default judgment against Mukilteo Smoke Shop and Mr.  
18 Ahmed; AWARDS GS Holistic statutory damages in the amount of \$5,000 and litigation

19             //

20             //

21             //

22             //

1 costs in the amount of \$827.00; and DENIES GS Holistic's requests for entry of a  
2 permanent injunction and for an order directing the destruction of infringing products.

3 Dated this 8th day of March, 2024.

4  
5   
6

JAMES L. ROBART  
United States District Judge

7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22